

APPLICANT(S): LIPSON, Stephen Geoffrey

SERIAL NO.: 10/552,047

FILED: September 6, 2006

Page 7

## **REMARKS**

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claims 5, 6, 8-14, 19, 20, and 22-28 have been objected to.

Claims 1-4, 7, 15-18, and 21 have been rejected.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended in this submission.

Claim 15 has been voluntarily amended to remove a typographical error. This amendment does not narrow the scope of the claim, nor is it being made for reasons of patentability. The amended claim is not subject to the complete bar against the use of the Doctrine of Equivalents as outlined in Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinsoku Kogyo Kapushiki Co., Ltd. a/ka/ SMC Corporation and SMt Pneumatics, Inc., as the amendment does not narrow the scope of the claim, nor is it being made for reasons of patentability.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims, specification and abstract add no new matter.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 5, 6, 8-14, 19, 20, 22-28 would be allowable if claims 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Applicants thankfully acknowledge the Examiner's statement, and reserve the right to amend the claims accordingly at a later time.

APPLICANT(S): LIPSON, Stephen Geoffrey

SERIAL NO.: 10/552,047

FILED: September 6, 2006

Page 8

### **Remarks to the Abstract**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract because the word “comprises” was used. The word “comprises” was replaced by “includes” as suggested by the Examiner.

### **Remarks to the Drawings**

In the Office Action the Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference number mentioned in the specification, namely, element 12 is not shown in Fig. 4a.

The Specification was corrected by replacing the phrase “reflector 12and reflector 14” by the phrase “reflector 14 and reflector 18”.

In the Office Action the Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) for using reference number “12” for both “a parallel light beam of light” and an “external reflector”.

The Specification was corrected by replacing the phrase “external reflector 12” by the phrase “external reflector 14”.

Applicants assert that the corrected Specification now matches the original drawings, and therefore there is no need to amend the drawings.

### **Remarks to the Specification**

The amendments to the specification are editorial in nature and do not introduce new matter.

APPLICANT(S): LIPSON, Stephen Geoffrey

SERIAL NO.: 10/552,047

FILED: September 6, 2006

Page 9

## **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Rogers (US 3,631,288). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection at least in view of the remarks that follow.

Rogers discloses an assembly for:

projecting polarized light uses a concave reflecting polarizer which is confocal with a concave metal reflector having a light source at its focus. Light possessing a preferred polarization azimuth is transmitted by the polarizer. Light possessing the orthogonal polarization azimuth is reflected back by the polarizer and circulates between the reflector and the polarizer. Its polarization is altered slightly by reflection from the metal. A small fraction, related to the degree of alteration, is transmitted by the polarizer. After several traverses a significant portion of the orthogonal polarization component is altered and transmitted through the polarizer. (Abstract).

In the Rogers reference, the polarizer is not positioned in an optical path between the two reflectors but rather behind the two reflectors. Light is reflected within Rogers' apparatus numerous times, the back of the polarizer serving as a mirror, and only light with polarization that matches the polarization azimuth of the polarizer is emitted.

As indicated in Rogers' column 1, lines 40-45 and 68-69, that disclosure is directed to an auto headlight incorporating a parabolic reflective polarizer, which emits uniformly linear polarized light vibrating in a selected azimuth depending upon the orientation of the polarizer selected.

Rogers does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing a light beam with spatially varying polarization, with "two circumferentially curved reflectors positioned substantially opposite each other" and "a polarizer positioned in an optical path between the two reflectors, for polarizing light reflected from one reflector before it reaches the other", to produce an outgoing light beam of spatially varying polarization", as claimed in apparatus claim 1, and in the corresponding method claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over the Rogers reference.

APPLICANT(S): LIPSON, Stephen Geoffrey

SERIAL NO.: 10/552,047

FILED: September 6, 2006

Page 10

Claims 2-4 and claims 16-18 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 15 (respectively), and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-4 and 16-18 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to independent claims 1 and 15 and to claims 2-4 and 16-18 dependent thereon.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4 and 15-18.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 15 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Rogers. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons that follow.

With regards to claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the parabolic reflector of Rogers when viewed as bisected can be viewed as being equivalent to a “first and second reflector positioned substantially opposite each other”, as these are cited in the present specification and claims. But even if it can be seen as such, Rogers does not teach or suggest (nor can it be derived from asserting that the parabolic reflector can be viewed as an the equivalent mentioned hereinabove that Rogers suggests or teaches) an apparatus for providing a light beam with spatially varying polarization, with “two circumferentially curved reflectors positioned substantially opposite each other” and “a polarizer positioned in an optical path between the two reflectors, for polarizing light reflected from one reflector before it reaches the other”, to produce an outgoing light beam of spatially varying polarization”, as claimed in apparatus claim 1, and in the corresponding method claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable over the Rogers reference.

Claims 7 and claims 21 depend from, directly or indirectly, claims 1 and 15 (respectively), and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 7 and 21 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants

APPLICANT(S): LIPSON, Stephen Geoffrey

SERIAL NO.: 10/552,047

FILED: September 6, 2006

Page 11

respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to independent claims 1 and 15 and to claims 7 and 21 dependent thereon.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 7, 15 and 21.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

/Guy Yonay/

Guy Yonay

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 52,388

Dated: June 18, 2009

**Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP**

1500 Broadway, 12th Floor

New York, New York 10036

Tel: (646) 878-0800

Fax: (646) 878-0801